

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application, with Claim 1 being an independent claim. Claims 1, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent Application Publication US 2004/0198433 A1 of Lee in view of Patent Application Publication US 2005/0014527 to Chambers, et al.; Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Chambers et al., and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication 2002-281142 to Sato et al.; Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Chambers et al. in view of Sato et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,120,379 to Tanaka et al.; and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Chambers et al., and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication 2002-359678 to Masami et al.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, the Examiner stated that one of the two reference characters "A1", used to designate both the horizontal and the vertical axes of rotation in FIG. 3 should be replaced with "A2". FIG. 3 has been amended such that the vertical axis of rotation is designated by "A2" and "Replacement Sheets" are attached hereto.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the objections to the drawing is respectfully requested.


Regarding the rejections of Claims 1-9 under §103(a), it is submitted that Lee is improperly cited as a reference against the claims of the present application. Please note that the Lee reference is owned by Samsung Electronics Co., the assignee of the present application, and qualifies as prior art only under §102(e). As such, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Lee does not qualify as prior art since subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102, shall not preclude patentability where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Further, regarding the rejection of Claims 1-9 under §103(a), it is submitted that Chambers et al. is improperly cited as a reference against the claims of the present application. Applicant has perfected

Further, regarding the rejection of Claims 1-9 under §103(a), it is submitted that Chambers et al. is improperly cited as a reference against the claims of the present application. Applicant has perfected the priority claim of the present application by filing a certified English translation of the priority document with this response. Chambers et al. was filed April 15, 2004, and the present application was filed March 29, 2004 and claimed priority to August 21, 2003 based on Korean Patent Application 2003-57963. The rejection based on Chambers et al. is moot based upon the filing of the certified English translation of the priority document. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475
PJF/PYM/mk